

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 20, 2004.

Claims 1-9 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-9 were rejected, and claim 3 was objected to. In this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-9 thus remain for consideration.

Applicant submits that claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

§102 Rejections / Claim Objection

Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art (AAPA).

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,567,366).

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant submits that the independent claims (claims 1, 5 and 9) are patentable over the AAPA and Kim.

Applicant's invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward an anamorphic prism, an optical head having an anamorphic prism, and an optical recording/reproduction device employing an anamorphic prism. Each of the claims recite that the anamorphic prism is made up of a first prism and a second prism that are bonded together. In operation, a light beam

passes through the anamorphic prism by entering the anamorphic prism through the first prism and exiting the anamorphic prism through the second prism. The claims specify that “the direction of propagation of the light beam exiting said second prism is substantially parallel to the direction of propagation of the light beam entering said first prism.”

Neither the AAPA nor Kim discloses an anamorphic prism that is made up of two prisms bonded together and operates such that the direction of propagation of the light beam exiting the second prism is substantially parallel to the direction of propagation of the light beam entering the first prism. In this regard, Applicant notes that in the bonded-prism structures discussed in the AAPA the light beam exiting the second prism is inclined relative to the light beam entering the first prism. For example, the anamorphic prism depicted in Fig. 1 inclines the exiting light beam by 24.63 degrees relative to the entering beam. Similarly, the anamorphic prism shown in Kim’s Fig. 3A inclines the light beam exiting surface 243 of prism 24 relative to the light beam entering surface 231 of prism 23.

Since neither the AAPA nor Kim discloses an anamorphic prism that is made up of two prisms bonded together and operates such that the direction of propagation of the light beam exiting the second prism is substantially parallel to the direction of propagation of the light beam entering the first prism, Applicant submits that claims 1, 5 and 9 are patentable over the AAPA and Kim - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Claims 2-4 depend on claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claims 2-4 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 6-8 depend on claim 5. Since claim 5 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claims 6-8 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 5.

Applicant submits that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Bruno Polito

Reg. No. 38,580

(212) 588-0800